

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 31, 39, 44, 49 and 58 have been amended. Claims 1-30, 37-38, 47 and 54-57 have been previously cancelled. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 31-36, 39-46, 48-53 and 58-60 are presented for examination.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-36, 39-41, 44-46, 48-51 and 58-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated over Rajasekharan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,961 (“Rajasekharan”), in view of Xie, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,393 (“Xie”), further in view of Adbulhayogu, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0030784 (“Adbulhayogu”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajasekharan discloses “a method for *secure streaming of digital audio/visual content*. Secure streaming provides *protection against unauthorized use of digital content*.” (Abstract; emphasis provided). Rajasekharan further discloses that the method “checks [a] digital signature, or other source indicator, in the authorization data *to determine whether the authorization data is received from an authorized source*. The digital signature can be, for example, either a Digital Signature Algorithm (DSA) signature . . . or a Rivest Shamir Adleman (RSA) algorithm.” (col. 4, lines 28-33; emphasis provided).

Xie discloses “a *message authentication code* (“MAC”) that is attached to digital content.” (col. 1, lines 27-29; emphasis provided) Watermarking is an example of a MAC system. A watermark is “*embedded in the media stream*, so that removal of the

watermark may destroy or visibly alter the underlying content.” (col. 1, lines 32-38; emphasis provided).

Adbulhayogu discloses that a “*digital signature . . . includes . . . [a] logo, company name and actual URL.*” (page 3, paragraph 0084, lines 2-4; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 31, in pertinent part, recites that “the unique validation key is generated based on a combination of a uniform resource locator (URL) and an encryption key.” (emphasis provided). Applicants submit that Rajasekharan, Xie and Adbulhayogu neither individually, nor when combined, in any combination teach or reasonably suggest such a feature. Rajasekharan discloses that a digital signature *can be* a DSA or RSA signature (col. 4, lines 28-33); however, nowhere does Rajasekharan teach or reasonably suggest that a “unique validation key is generated based on . . . an encryption key” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Stated differently, a digital signature *being* an DSA or RSA signature is not the same as a unique key being *generated based on* an encryption key.

In addition, Adbulhayogu discloses a digital signature that *includes* a URL (page 3, paragraph 0084, lines 2-4); however, nowhere does Adbulhayogu disclose that a “unique validation key is generated based on . . . a uniform resource locator (URL)” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). In other words, a digital signature that *includes* a URL is not the same as a unique key being *generated based on* a URL. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to claim 31 and its dependent claims.

Claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 contain limitations similar to those of claims 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 and their dependent claims.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 42-43, 52-53 and 55-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan in view of Xie further in view of Willis, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,738,815 (“Willis”).

With regard to claims 42-43, 52-53 and 55-56, they depend from independent claims 39 and 49, respectively and thus, include the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42-43, 52-53 and 55-56.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


### **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 19, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980